

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Yeh for noting that claims 3-5 and 8-9 contain allowable subject matter that would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, the Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 USC § 103 (a) over US Patent No. 5,875,215 in view of US Patent No. 4,866,395. In addition, the Office Action required correction of several informalities in claims 2, 6 & 7. Accordingly, applicants have amended the claims to (i) withdraw the rejected base claim 1 without prejudice; (ii) remove informalities as required to place the claims in form for allowance; and (iii) amend the claims to overcome objections by rewriting them as independent claims that incorporate all of the limitations of the rejected base and any intervening claims. Applicants have also amended the claims to correct other informalities or typographical errors. No new matter is introduced or any new issues raised by way of any of these amendments.

Corrections of Informalities and Typographical Errors

Applicants have amended claims 2-9, to which the Office Action objected, to correct various informalities. In addition, various additional informalities in claims 2-9 have been removed without introducing any new matter. These informalities include single claims spanning more than one sentence and clear recitation of method steps.

As to claim 2, the recitation of “the frequency generator” has been corrected to recite instead “frequency generating means,” for which proper antecedent basis exists in claim 2 itself. The term “the VCO” has been changed to “a VCO” as suggested by the Office Action.

Claim 2 has also been amended to include all of the limitations of the withdrawn claim 1 and rewriting it as an independent claim. The remaining claims 3-9 have also been amended to ensure that they depend ultimately on the now independent claim 2.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, proper antecedent basis is provided by changing “receiver of claim 1” to read as “receiving means of claim 2,” which is properly recited in claim 2 to provide the required antecedent basis.

In claim 7, as suggested by the Office Action, “one-data-bit-dalay-line” has been replaced by “one-data-bit-delay-line.”

Cancellation of Claim 1 and Claim Amendments to Overcome Objections

Applicants have withdrawn claim 1 from consideration without prejudice. In addition, claim 2, which was previously dependent upon claim 1, has been rewritten as an independent claim.

Since the objections to claim 2, now rewritten as an independent claim, have been overcome, it is now patentable while having the same scope as the originally presented claim 2.

Moreover, since claims 3-5, and 8-9 no longer depend on a rejected base claim, they too are patentable. Claims 3-5, and 8-9, which have been corrected as described above with regard to formal matters, continue to depend upon claim 2.

Claims 6-7, with their informalities have been corrected in accordance with the suggestions of the Office Action, are also patentable since they now depend from the allowable base claim 2.



CONCLUSION

Following the entry of this response and claim amendments herein all of the pending claims 2-9 are placed in form for allowance. No new matter has been introduced by way of any of the amendments to the claims or the specification. Applicants respectfully request that they be allowed to proceed to issuance without delay.

No fee is estimated to be required for this submission other than the fee for the accompanying Petition for Extension of Time of two (2) months.. Please charge any required fee to Deposit Account No. 16-1150.

Date: July 28, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Gidon D. Stern

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP

1155 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2711

(212) 790-9090

27,469
(Reg. No.)

